CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM WATER QUALITY GOAL IMPLEMENTATION TEAM

AUGUST 24, 2020 | ACTIONS AND DECISIONS

Meeting Materials: Link

Action: The WQGIT will conduct a fatal flaw review the BMP Verification Ad- Hoc Action Team's draft Task Statement. All feedback, if any, is due to Vanessa Van Note (<u>VanNote.Vanessa@epa.gov</u>) by **COB August 31, 2020.**

Action: WQGIT leadership will schedule an SRS meeting for early September to discuss prioritization criteria and the revised logic and action plan for the 2025 WIP Outcome.

Action: After discussion, the WQGIT did not reach consensus on whether to proportionally divide NY's Nitrogen load so they stay at 0.4 million pounds under the watershed loads first option (take out jurisdictional watershed climate-related increases in N and P loads first and then allocate the remainder). The votes were as follows:

- NY: Agreement with reservations
- PA: Hold
- DE: Stand aside
- MD: Agreement with reservations
- *VA*: Agreement with reservations
- WV: Endorsement
- DC: Endorsement
- *CBC*: Stand aside
- *EPA*: Stand aside
- John Bell, PA Farm Bureau: Hold
- Denice Wardrop, CRC: Agreement with reservations
- Lindsay Thompson, DE/MD Agribusiness Assoc.: Stand aside
- Evan Miles, DoD: Stand Aside
- Beth McGee, CBF: Stand Aside
- Jenn Volk, UD: Agreement with reservations

Action: The WQGIT leadership will meet with PA to discuss how consensus can be reached on the watershed loads first option with the additional special case for NY. Additionally, time will be scheduled into the SRS meeting (see above) to reach consensus on this and the remaining climate allocation options (1. NPS Only; 2. NPS+PS; 3. Set WWTP at 8 mg/l and 4 mg/l total nitrogen and adjust non-WWTP line for the remainder). These climate policy options are scheduled to be presented to the Management Board during its September 17th conference call.

The items below were not discussed at the WQGIT August $24^{\rm th}$ meeting but is a proposed path forward to consensus from the GIT leadership.

Leadership proposal: Use both the NPS Only and NPS+PS allocation approaches to produce a range in lieu of a single value for the 2035 estimate. When the 2035 estimates are revised in 2025, we commit to revisiting this allocation question (NPS Only or NPS+PS).

Based on the <u>survey results</u>, option 3 above, the 8mg/l N and 4 mg/l P option was the least popular with four members at STOP or HOLD. We should eliminate this option.

The remaining two options, NPS Only and NPS+PS have almost identical survey results, each with two members at STOP or HOLD. If the WQGIT reaches consensus on the Watershed Loads First with NY Special Case option, the decision on NPS Only or NPS+PS has no bearing on the 2025 climate change loads. This is because in 2025, reducing the increased watershed loads (watersheds loads first with NY Special case) will allow us to meet the required anoxic volume without any additional allocation. But the decision does affect the 2035 estimate that we previously decided to include as part of a narrative in the 2022-2023 Milestones. The proposed compromise is to use both the NPS Only and NPS+PS allocation approaches to produce a range in lieu of a single value for N and for P for the 2035 estimate. When the 2035 estimates are revised in 2025, we commit to revisiting this allocation question (NPS Only or NPS+PS).